

**REMARKS****Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview**

United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Examiner Jean Lesperance is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicants' undersigned representative during a telephone interview held on October 4, 2005 regarding this application. During the interview, Applicants' undersigned representative discussed the differences between the features of independent claims 1 and 6 and the arrangement of Fig. 1, which was applied as prior art against the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The Examiner listened to the distinctions that were explained by Applicants' undersigned representative during the interview. The Examiner then noted that he would prefer that Applicants file these arguments in writing so that he could study them in more detail before making any decisions about the next course of action.

Accordingly, this Response and Request for Reconsideration is being filed in response to the Final Office Action dated May 17, 2005. This Response includes the arguments that were presented by Applicants' undersigned representative in the telephone interview on October 4, 2005 in accordance with the Examiner's request. These arguments are presented in the following section.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being "unpatentable over the admitted prior art (Fig. 1)." These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that there are significant differences between the arrangement shown in Fig. 1 of the instant application and the combination of features recited in independent claim 1 of the instant application. For example, as described at page 4, lines 3-12 of the instant application's specification, the arrangement shown in Fig. 1 has particular disadvantages in that it is necessary to provide a constant current driving circuit (see CCg in Fig. 1) in the anode driver IC 2 for each column electrode line of the display panel. This results in the structure of the anode driver IC being complex, making it difficult to downsize the anode driver IC and also difficult to reduce manufacturing costs. In addition, the instant application's specification explains that because a current is constantly supplied from the constant current driving circuit to the column electrode line that corresponds to an EL element to be driven for light emission, the overall power consumption of the IC is quite high in the Fig. 1 arrangement.

These concerns are addressed by various embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application, as described in independent claim 1, for example. One such example is shown in Fig. 2 of the instant application. Fig. 2 illustrates that the switching and voltage supply arrangements associated with each of the anode driver IC 20 and the cathode driver IC 30 are particularly different from that shown in Fig. 1. For example, each of the switch elements Sa1 to Sam in the anode driver IC 20 has three possible switch positions. The first position connects that switch (Sa1, for example) to voltage Va0 through a resistor Ra0. During the reset period, each of the switches of the anode driver IC 20 are connected in this first position. The second position connects the switch (Sa1, for example) to voltage Vascn through resistor Rsa. During the light emission period, each of the switches of the anode driver IC 20 that are connected to a non-light emission column electrode line are connected in this second position. The third position is when the switch (Sa1, for example) is in an "open" position. During the light

emission period, each of the switches of the anode driver IC 20 that are connected to a light emission column electrode line are placed in this “open” position.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is well understood in the electrical switch arts that a “closed” position of a switch is a position in which current is allowed to flow through the switch and an “open” position of a switch is a position in which the current path has been broken. Accordingly, as shown, for example, in Fig. 2 of the instant application, switch Sa1 of the anode driver IC 20 is in an “open” position because it is not connected to either of the voltages Va0 or Vascn.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is clear that the arrangement shown in the applied Fig. 1 does not include such an “open” position for switch Sa1. For example, instead of having three possible positions, the switch Sa1 of Fig. 1 has only two possible positions (connected to constant current source CCg or connected to ground through resistor Ra). Both of the possible switch position in Fig. 1 are “closed” positions.

On the Interview Summary form, the Examiner notes that this feature of an open position of the switch Sa1 “is not in the claim.” Applicants respectfully traverse such an assertion because claim 1 clearly recites in lines 16-20 that the column electrode driver circuit “opens the light emission column electrode line” in the light emission period. As discussed with the Examiner during the above-discussed Examiner Interview held on October 4, 2005, this open position feature is thus specifically recited in the claim, and, to the extent that any clarification might be necessary, the foregoing arguments describing this open switch position will make the file history of this application clear in this regard.

A second important point regarding independent claim 1, as also discussed in the Examiner Interview held on October 4, 2005, involves features that were added to independent

claim 1 (as well as to independent claim 6) in the Amendment filed on January 27, 2005 in this application. In particular, during a light emission period, a leak current flows into the capacitive light emitting element driven to emit light, as a drive current via parasitic capacitors of the capacitive light emitting elements connected between the row electrode lines other than the scan line and the light emission column electrode line.

At page 6, lines 10-11 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner noted that “[i]f Sa1 is open and Scn switch is connected to Rg, there is a light emission where the storage of the capacitance will light the light emitting element.” The Examiner’s assertion in this regard is traversed for at least two reasons.

First, Applicants respectfully submit that the switch Sa1 of the applied Fig. 1 of the instant application is never “open” as discussed in detail previously. To the extent that the Examiner might continue to maintain his position that Fig. 1 shows an “open” position for switch Sa1, he is requested to provide a detailed explanation of such in the next Office Communication.

Secondly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s assertion in this portion of page 6 of the Final Office Action, as quoted above, that “the storage of the capacitance will light the light emitting element” is not technically accurate with regard to the arrangement of Fig. 1. In particular, in the reset period associated with Fig. 1, all of the parasitic capacitors C in the display panel are discharged because each of the switches Sa1 to Sam is connected to ground through the resistance Ra. Similarly, each of the switches Sc1 to Scn is connected to ground through the resistance Rg. This will cancel any resulting capacitance so that when the reset period is complete, no residual capacitance will remain in the parasitic capacitors C for use during the light emission period. Because of this, there will be very little or no leak current associated with the parasitic capacitors in the light emission period, and certainly not enough of

such leak current to drive a light emitting element to emit light, as specifically recited in independent claim 1. See, for example, lines 24-28 of claim 1. Accordingly, these features of independent claim 1 are also not disclosed, nor even suggested, by the arrangement in Fig. 1. Instead, the arrangement of Fig. 1 would teach away from this residual capacitance feature by discharging the parasitic capacitors during the reset period, as discussed previously.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn because the arrangement shown in Fig. 1 does not teach, or even suggest, each feature of independent claim 1. The rejections of independent method claim 6 should also be withdrawn for similar reasons as discussed above with regard to independent claim 1. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 6 are in condition for allowance. In addition, dependent claims 2-5 are also in condition for allowance at least because of their dependence on independent claim 1.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge

the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0573. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

*Peter J. Sitarz, For*

Dated: October 17, 2005

By: PETER J. SITARZ, REG. NO. 48,183

Paul A. Fournier

Registration No. 41,023

**Customer No. 55694**

**DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100

Washington, D.C. 20005-1209

Tel: (202) 842-8800

Fax: (202) 842-8465